

H-138
120
SECESSION, CONCESSION, OR

SELF-POSSESSION:

WHICH?



BOSTON:

WALKER, WISE, AND COMPANY,

245, WASHINGTON STREET.

1861.

BOSTON:

PRINTED BY JOHN WILSON AND SON,

22, SCHOOL STREET.

WILL THE SLAVE STATES SECEDE, OR RECEDE?
SHALL THE FREE STATES CONCEDE?

TO THE HON. CHARLES SUMNER.

DEAR SIR, — In the early and legendary history of Rome, it is related that one of the Sibyls brought to Tarquin the Second nine books of oracles, containing an account of the future fortunes of the Roman race. Thinking her price exorbitant, the king refused to buy them; whereupon she burned three volumes, and asked the same price for the remaining six. Tarquin could not make up his mind to pay it. Then she burned three more, and asked the same price for the three which remained. The monarch was astonished; consulted the augurs, and, by their advice, bought the books; which were preserved in the Capitol, with much care, for many centuries.

The same Sibyl has visited our country and our rulers many times during the last twenty years. She came at the time of the annexation of Texas, and offered us prosperity, union, and freedom. But the price which she asked we thought high; we could not afford to pay it: it was a courageous and firm resistance to the demands of the slave-power. Such

resistance, at that time, would have settled all difficulties ; for the largest and best part of the Slave States were, for a long time, opposed to annexation. But the North was divided, and could offer no firm resistance. The slave-power triumphed, and Texas was annexed to the Union, with the avowed purpose of extending and strengthening slavery. In 1850, the Sibyl came again, and offered us somewhat less at the same price. If we should have the courage then to exclude slavery by law from the Territories, we should encounter difficulty. The slave-power would resist and threaten, but there would be no disunion. But again we thought the price too high, and we did not pay it. We had another offer in 1856, which we declined. And now, in 1860, the Sibyl comes again. She offers us far less than at first. We can still have freedom and national prosperity, but not union. Some States have decided to leave us ; but they may leave us peacefully, and many of the Slave States may remain with us. But, if we are afraid to pay the price, the Sibyl will come again and again, offering less each time ; and we shall have at last to come to her terms : for the name of the Sibyl is OPPORTUNITY.

We can never purchase a permanent settlement of the controversy between Freedom and Slavery but by firm resistance to its encroachments. That is the price which is to be paid, sooner or later. Every other solution of the difficulty must fail hereafter, as it has failed heretofore. Only, the longer the solution is deferred, the worse our position will be. By firm re-

sistance to the demands of slavery in past times, the question might have been for ever settled, leaving us a free and united nation. By firm, calm resistance now, we shall remain a free and prosperous nation, perhaps with the temporary loss of some States. But we can part peacefully. There need be no strife between us. *We* do not wish to make war upon them, and *they* are not strong enough to make war upon us. But if, for the sake of retaining these States in the Union, we make still further concessions, we are preparing for the future a much more terrific solution of the question. Somewhere we must resist: we must take a stand somewhere. If we take this stand now, all that the seceding States ask is permission to go out in peace. But, if we concede now, they will certainly come in a year or two with fresh demands, to which it will be impossible for us to submit; and, when we do at last resist, the Union will be divided, not by the secession of the Gulf States alone, but it will be rent asunder at the centre or broken into many fragments, and that after a destructive war.

For the Slave States already intimate that they must have a change in the organic law. They demand a convention of States to change the Constitution, so as to make it less republican. They desire to introduce an element of oligarchy. Long since, they have denied and scoffed at the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence. They now deny the right of the majority to govern the country; and they wish to have the Constitution so altered, that a minority, and not a majority, shall govern.

We have seen many crises in our day ; but the present seems to me the most important of all. Many of the great voices which might have instructed us concerning the duties of this solemn hour are silent in the grave. The sublime soul of Channing is no more with us ; the noble eloquence of Henry Clay is silenced ; the great weight of John Quincy Adams is removed ; the commanding and comprehensive intellect of Webster is gone ; the indignant voice of Theodore Parker is hushed ; the actors whose energetic wills were dedicated to freedom are also taken away ; the strong arm of Andrew Jackson, the manly courage of Zachary Taylor, and the eccentric but honest energy of Benton, are not here to aid us now.

“The knights are dust, and their good swords rust :
Their souls are with the saints, we trust ;” —

or, if not with the saints, at any rate with the heroes and champions of Freedom.

Under these circumstances, it seems proper for the people themselves everywhere to express their convictions, that their representatives may understand a little what is the real public sentiment of the country, and arrange their measures accordingly. I believe that there is a very general sentiment among the people, that the issue must be met now, and the question finally settled ; that no more concessions can be made with safety, and that further compromises are impossible.

I share this belief, and will give some of the reasons which seem to me to justify it.

Will the South secede, and why? This is the first question; and it may be answered by the accomplished fact, before these words I am now writing are printed. For I think that some of the Southern States mean to secede, and that immediately; and that they will fulfil their design. Yet let us ask, What are their motives? What leads them to do that which seems to us so rash and dangerous?

There are two principal causes which will produce secession; the one a reason, the other a motive. The reason is, that they think it will be for their advantage to secede: the motive is, that they hate the antislavery element in the Free States. The reason applies principally to South Carolina and the cotton-growing States. The motive applies to nearly all of these slaveholding communities. If they act according to their opinions, only a few States will secede; but if according to their feelings, many more may follow. It cannot be made even to *seem* the interest of the farming Slave States to secede; but, if their feelings are excited, they may go in spite of their interests. Those, therefore, who desire that the secession shall be small, should, above all things, seek to prevent the Northern Slave States from committing themselves to a demand for compromises which they can never obtain. Here, at present, lies our principal danger. Every one who encourages the farming Slave States to assume the position of mediators, in order to get some concession from the North which shall quiet South Carolina, increases the risk of a larger secession; for, as we shall by and by show, it

is impossible for the North to make any concession, and there is nothing to compromise. But if Virginia and Kentucky demand that the North yield something in order that South Carolina may consent to stay in the Union, and are disappointed, as they will be, they may decide to secede also, though against their interests, in consequence of their disappointment.

I think that no one can read Southern speeches or Southern newspapers, without being convinced that the leading men at the extreme South think that it will be for their interest to leave the Union, and to unite in a great slaveholding, cotton-growing, commercial confederacy. They reason thus: "Cotton is king. We raise the cotton, — the great export of the country, — indispensable to the prosperity of England, indispensable to that of the Northern States. Why, then, are our States comparatively poor and weak? We are falling behind continually in wealth, and the power is passing out of our hands. Soon the North will have every thing its own way. Its interests are essentially different from ours. It will govern us for its own good; will pass such tariffs as it chooses; will build up its manufactures and its commerce at the expense of ours. Already Boston, New York, and Philadelphia are elevated to colossal dimensions at our expense. The interests of the two sections are essentially hostile. The North has the majority, and will soon control the whole Government. It will necessarily govern the country for its own interest, not ours. Our only safety is in separation. We can then have free trade; we can make Charleston, Savannah, and

Mobile free ports, which will create at once a direct trade with Europe, and build up great commercial cities at home."

This is the view which satisfies the leading statesmen of the South that it is for their interest to separate. It is not a pretence: it is a conviction. It has this truth, also, at its foundation, — that the needs and desires of the two sections are really opposite: the interests of slavery and freedom are not identical. Republican institutions are unsuited to slavery: true democracy is to them impossible. Therefore universal suffrage has never been the rule in the Slave States. The government of the South is virtually an oligarchy. Although the Slave States have only three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders and six million white non-slaveholders, yet who but slaveholders are ever sent to Congress from the Slave States, or elected governors or judges in any of them? All the wealth of these States is in the hands of the slaveholders. United by this immense common interest, they possess the whole power. It is necessary that they should have it for their own safety; and necessity knows no law.

The slaveholders, therefore, have a vision in their mind of a powerful military State, of which slavery shall be the basis, bound together by a common interest, commercially independent and prosperous. Useless to tell them that trade will follow its own laws; that a country without manufactures, without diversified industry, without home-markets, can have no steady prosperity; that cities do not spring up as the result of

political combinations; that the buyer is no more dependent on the seller than the seller on the buyer; that the North, with its immensely varied industry, would still be prosperous, though all its cotton manufactures were destroyed;* but that, if the South could not sell its cotton, it would starve. Useless to remind them of their danger from insurrection; to ask where their revenue is to come from with free ports; to suggest the difference of opinion of Virginia and Alabama in regard to the slave-trade; to inquire how direct taxation will suit the six million non-slaveholders. Thoughtful men at the South consider these things; but thoughtful men have little power over Southern deliberations now. These dangers are contingent and future: the immediate danger is of being governed by the North in the interest of the North.

This is the reason which induces secession: the feeling which prompts to it is hostility of conviction. Hostile interests are the reason, hostile convictions the motive, for secession. The South believes slavery to be right and good: the North believes it wrong and evil. This makes our connection with them a constant rebuke. Their conscience is kept in a state of perpetual irritation. They feel the presence of an irrepressible conflict. The whole North, in their view, is filled with abolitionists; and abolitionists are people who wish the slaves to cut their masters' throats. They have been taught to believe, by North-

* The whole annual product of Massachusetts, for example, is over three hundred million dollars; of which its manufactures of cotton, calico, and bleached goods, are only thirty-six million dollars, — about one-ninth.

ern democratic papers, that the whole Republican party sympathizes with John Brown and his invasion of Virginia. They are allowed to see no Republican papers, and therefore are easily imposed upon by these falsehoods. No wonder, therefore, that they hate us; that they are incurably alienated from us. They look upon us as a cold, calculating race, without sympathy for their trials; consulting only our own sordid interests; managing by contrivance to get the better of them, but destitute of all honorable, high-minded, chivalric sentiments. They have, therefore, come to hate us, just as the Irish hate the English, or as the Venetians hate the Austrians.

Interest and feeling thus concurring toward secession, it is highly probable that some of the Slave States really intend to secede. But how many? The answer would be "All," if they were homogeneous; but, being heterogeneous, probably not all. The Slave States may be divided into the slave-producing States, the Slave-using States, and the Slave-consuming States. Virginia belongs to the first class, producing more than she uses: she therefore exports them to the more Southern States. Her slave-crop brings her in perhaps ten million dollars a year. Such States as Kentucky, Tennessee, and North Carolina, are Slave-using States, producing all they want for themselves, but no more. But Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, are Slave-consuming States: they use up their slaves. On the great cotton and sugar plantations, the average expectation of life for a slave is about six years. They are worked to death in

about that time. The owners are absentees ; leaving their estates to overseers and managers. The overseers are paid in proportion to what they can make the estate yield. The number of bales of cotton to a negro decides whether their salary shall be five hundred dollars or two thousand.

Now, the interest of these sections is different. The Slave-consuming States desire that the African slave-trade shall be re-opened : then they could get a slave for three hundred dollars, instead of fifteen hundred dollars. But the re-opening of the slave-trade would destroy the whole value of the slave-crop of Virginia ; and would, in fact, make it her interest to emancipate.

The interests of these three classes are wholly different. It is the interest of the Slave-producing States to stay in the Union, and to prevent the other States from going out of it ; since, once out of the Union, they would immediately re-open the slave-trade, and so destroy the value of the slaves as an export in the Northern Slave States. The interest of the Slave-using States is to remain in the Union themselves ; but they have no such strong motive to resist the secession of the rest. Accordingly, the principal efforts to prevent secession may be expected from the Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee politicians. If these fail, and the cotton States secede, they will probably go out by themselves. The four States which voted against Breckinridge (Virginia, Missouri, Kentucky, Tennessee), voted against secession. To these may be added Delaware and Maryland, whose interests bind them to the North, and which must soon

be Free States. Nor is it probable that North Carolina or Arkansas will wish to leave the Union; and it seems quite impossible for Louisiana to go out, even if she wishes to. Therefore secession will be confined to five States; which seems to be the opinion of the secessionists themselves, since their flag contains only five stars.

For the reasons and motives before mentioned, these five States may secede. The next question is, How will they secede?

Some say they have no right to secede, and they must be prevented by force from seceding. Others say they have a right to secede, and ought not to be prevented in any way. Mr. Buchanan says they have no right to secede, and we have no right to prevent them. The "Tribune" says they have no right to secede, and we have a right to prevent them, but it will be inexpedient to exercise it.

All these views are intelligible, except that of the President: that is simply an absurdity. That which a State has no right to do, the other States have a right to prevent her from doing. Mr. Buchanan's view is merely that of a weak man, who desires to avoid responsibility.

To us it seems clear, that, according to the fundamental principles of our Government, the secessionists are right in their main principle. If a State considers itself oppressed in the Union, it has a right to leave the Union peaceably. This is only affirming the principles of self-government, which are asserted in the Declaration of Independence, and in almost

every State Constitution. The Declaration of Independence asserts in terms, that, whenever any form of government becomes destructive of the ends of government, "it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government; laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

So, too, declares the Constitution of Massachusetts; saying, that "when the objects of government are not obtained, the people have a right to alter the government."

The Constitution of Maine says (art. 1), "All power is inherent in the people; all free governments are founded in their authority, and instituted for their benefit: they have, therefore, an unalienable and indefeasible right to institute government, and to alter, reform, or totally change the same, when their safety and happiness require it."

Constitution of New Hampshire (art. 1, sect. 10): "Government being instituted for the common benefit, &c.; therefore, whenever the ends of government are perverted, or public liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are ineffectual, the people may, and of right ought to, reform the old or establish a new government."

Constitution of Vermont (chap. 1, art. 7): "The community hath an indubitable, unalienable, and indefeasible right to reform or alter government in such manner as shall be by that community judged most conducive to the public weal."

Constitution of Connecticut (art. 1, sect. 2) says the same.

Constitution of Pennsylvania (art. 9, sect. 2) says the same.

Constitution of Delaware, in its preamble, says the same.

Constitution of Maryland, in its Declaration of Rights (sect. 4), says the same.

Constitution of Virginia, Bill of Rights (art. 3), says the same; giving this power of altering or abolishing the government to a "majority of the community."

Constitution of Mississippi (art. 1, sect. 2) says the same.

Constitution of Alabama (art. 1, sect. 2) says the same.

Constitution of Kentucky (art. 10, sect. 2) says the same.

Constitution of Tennessee (art. 11, sect. 1) says the same.

And so say the Constitutions of Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, and most of the other States.

"All this is true," it may be said; "but this refers, not to the right of secession, but to the right of revolution." But what is the difference? Webster defines revolution, "a material or entire change in the constitution of government." In this sense, no doubt, secession is revolution. If, then, they have the right of revolution, have we the right of preventing them from exercising it? If not, secession is only another name for peaceable revolution. Call

it by that name, and it will not affect the question before us ; which is, Have we a right to prevent them, by the exercise of force, from leaving the Union? Certainly we have not, if they have a right to go ; and that they have a right to go is asserted by the Declaration of Independence and in nearly every State Constitution.

But it is said that no such right is given by the Constitution of the United States. Provision is made for admitting States ; but no provision is made for letting them go out. This is true ; and the reason is obvious. The Constitution was intended as a bond of union, and it was hoped and expected that the Union would be lasting. Nevertheless, it may be right, under certain circumstances, for it to come to an end. No provision for a divorce is inserted in a marriage contract ; for it is intended and expected that the marriage will be perpetual : yet there always remains the possibility of a divorce under certain circumstances. The object of the Constitution was to provide for union : consequently nothing was said in it about secession. Nevertheless, two of the amendments to the Constitution (IX. and X.) imply that this supreme power is reserved to the States or the people. Art. X. says, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people." Now, one of the powers which the States and the people possessed before accepting the Constitution was the power of deciding whether to be in the Union or out of it ; for other-

wise they could not have come in. Now, this power is nowhere delegated to the United States, nor prohibited to the States: therefore it is still retained by them. This seems to me conclusive as regards the constitutional right of secession.

Great stress has been laid by Judge Story, Mr. Webster, and others, on the fact that the preamble to the Constitution commences with the words, "We, the people of the United States," and not "We, the States." This, no doubt, shows that the people were then acting in their sovereign capacity; and this, I think, requires that they shall act in the same capacity if they secede. It must be the *people* who go out, as it was the people who came in. Secession cannot be accomplished by the act of a legislature, but must be accomplished by a convention of the whole people in any State. This, I think, we have not only a right to demand, but are bound to insist upon by the article of the Constitution (art. 4, sect. 4), which declares, "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government." Judge Story, commenting on this, says, "The people of each State have a right to protection against the tyranny of a domestic faction." For these two reasons, therefore, no State should be allowed to secede until a majority of the people of the State have distinctly voted for secession.

Acting on this principle, which is the foundation of all republics, that sovereign power resides in the people, and that they have a right to change, abolish, or renew their form of government at pleasure, we

have seen this very year several States in Europe vote themselves out of one union and into another. The people of Savoy and Nice have voted to secede from Sardinia, and join themselves to France. True, this movement was not initiated by the people, but originated with their government; yet, when the governments called upon them to vote on the question, they distinctly recognized this right in the people. We have also seen Parma, Modena, Tuscany, Naples and Sicily, and most of the provinces of the Pontifical States, annex themselves by a popular vote to the kingdom of Sardinia. Europe recognizes, at least by acquiescence, their right to do so. The most striking case, however, is that of the Emilia and Romagna, with the delegations of Bologna and Ferrara, Urbino and Ancona, which have seceded from the Pontifical States, and annexed themselves to a foreign power. The Papal court complains, and endeavors to retain them by force; but even the Catholic powers of Europe refuse to aid it. Thus even the despotic governments of Europe acquiesce in the exercise of this right of secession. We also approve of it when it is exercised by an Italian State. Shall we deny the right only to the people of our own States?

“Yes,” you say: “we admit the right in a case like this. But this is the right of revolution, not of secession.” But what is the difference between revolution and secession but this, — that revolution is secession accomplished forcibly: secession is revolution accomplished peaceably? If the British Government had agreed to our independence, our revolution would

have been peaceable secession. Who was to blame for its not being so? The power which refused to let us go peaceably; for, if we had a right to go, Great Britain had no right to prevent us from going. If, therefore, you grant the right of revolution, you grant with it the right of secession. The greater includes the less. If a State has a right to obtain its independence by force, it certainly has a right to obtain its independence peaceably. I do not see how those who grant the right of revolution can deny the right of secession.

Suppose that the State of South Carolina having determined to secede from the Union, that the Federal Government should refuse to let her go. We attempt to retain her by force. She attempts by force to secede. Secession has now become revolution; and what was wrong, if done peaceably, has become right when done forcibly. I can see no sense in this course of reasoning; except, perhaps, this: You may say, that if a State is so much in earnest about secession that it is willing to fight for it, it shows that it is at least convinced itself that it ought to go. It will not act lightly, therefore, but will count the cost, if it has to fight for its independence. Thus, by granting the right of revolution, but denying that of secession, we prevent a dissolution of the Union, except under the gravest circumstances; but if we admit that a State has a right to secede from the Union whenever it will, by merely passing a vote to that effect, we make the Union a mere rope of sand, and destroy the stability of the Government.

This is the most serious argument against the right of secession. But there are several assumptions implied in it, which must be examined. It assumes that nations are capricious in regard to their institutions, and disposed to change them unnecessarily. But all experience shows the opposite. It is one of the most difficult things in the world to change the form of government; and it will only be done by a people which is either suffering great evils, or at least believes itself to be suffering great evils, from its existing institutions. It also assumes, that to grant only the right of revolution is safer than to grant the right of secession. But the most unstable governments in the world are those of Mexico and the South-American States; and this not because of peaceable changes in their institutions, but in consequence of perpetual revolutions. Our own Revolutionary War began, and many battles were fought, before we were ready for secession from England. That which gives stability to the institutions of a country is the character and condition of the people. The slaveholding republics of the South are uneasy because of their condition and character. They are discontented with the Union, because free institutions and the government of the majority do not suit a slaveholding State. They need despotic institutions and a standing army. Freedom of speech and of the press is already abolished among them: the logic of events requires that all other free institutions should follow. They are unequally yoked together with States where every thing is really free. To admit

the right of secession will not tend to break up the Union, or make it unstable, because the majority of the States are contented and prosperous in the Union. As long as they find the Union a benefit and blessing, and for a good while longer, they will continue in it : when they cease to find it so, they cannot be retained.

It is idle to hope to keep States in the Union against their will. Suppose that we should have in the Presidential chair an Andrew Jackson instead of that "mush of concession" who now occupies it. Suppose that, by using the whole military and naval power of the United States, we should conquer South Carolina. What should we do with it after it was conquered? How hold it as a conquered State? How guarantee to it republican institutions, when we are occupying it with a military force? Such questions show how impossible it is to attempt to prevent secession by exercising the force of the Government.

The result, therefore, of our argument, is this : States *have* a right to secede ; but secession must be the work of the whole people. The people must vote distinctly on that issue ; and the separation must be accomplished regularly and deliberately, — not by violence, but by an orderly method.

The next question is, What ought the North to do ? Shall the North concede ?

This question includes several others. What *ought* the North to concede to the South ? What *can* the North concede to the South ? What concession does the South *demand* ? What concession will *prevent* secession ?

What ought the North to concede ?

The answer is simple. To preserve the Union, we ought to concede any thing but that which the Union is intended to secure. The Union is a means, not an end. We must not sacrifice the end to the means. The end of the Union is to secure prosperity, peace, justice, equal rights, and liberty. It is evident, therefore, that these are not to be sacrificed, even to preserve the Union. We must not surrender any of the principles which are at the foundation of the State, and on which the Union itself was built, even to preserve the Union. Compromises are good, when they surrender what is expedient only, giving up a part of a good thing to save the rest ; but not good when they surrender justice and right.

The Union is a means to an end. Give up the end in order to preserve the means, and both become worthless ; but if you preserve the end, though you lose the means, then other means may be found to take the place. Suppose the Union is dissolved. It is a great evil, no doubt. But is it irreparable ? Is it impossible to do in 1860 that which was done in 1787 ? Were the people so much better and wiser in those days than they are now ? or did the framers of the Constitution enjoy some special divine inspiration which *we* have not ? Have we no longer trust in a Divine Providence which will guide us to-day as it guided our fathers then ?

For no light or common cause should we surrender the Union ; but for no light cause will it be surrendered. The danger is not that way, as far as

the people of the Free States are concerned. All history shows that people will bear almost any thing, and concede almost every thing, before they will consent to any great change in their institutions. This is as true now as when it was asserted in the Declaration of Independence, that "all experience has shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed." The danger often is, that, from fear of change, we shall concede what we ought not to concede, and so throw upon our posterity the duty of making the change when it has become still more difficult.

Men talk about the Union and our present Constitution as though they were arrived at by some happy accident or some secular conjunction of the planets, which could happen only once in a thousand years. But the Constitution was then adopted, and the Union formed, because they corresponded to the opinions and wishes of the people. For the same reason, they have continued. The same kind of constitutions, and forms of government, as good as ours, have been adopted by Mexico and by the South-American States; but, not corresponding to the character of the people, they have been useless and inefficient. The convictions of the people of South Carolina and Georgia, in regard to liberty and slavery, have wholly changed since the Union was formed and the Constitution adopted. They do not now believe in democratic and republican institutions: hence they wish to separate. When they do, they will immediately attempt to esta-

blish some consolidated system, some kind of despotism. The substance of democracy will be immediately relinquished, and its forms will speedily follow. But the people of the North still believe firmly in republican principles: consequently, if the present form of government should be dissolved, another of the same kind will very soon replace it.

It is emphatically true in this case, that, where there's a will, there's a way. While we believe in the end, there will be no difficulty about the means. While we cherish faith in justice, humanity, and freedom, so long as we believe in the principles of democracy and in true republicanism, so long we shall be able to organize these principles in suitable institutions. Spenser says truly, that —

“Of the soul the body form doth take;
For soul is form, and doth the body make.”

We must not, therefore, sacrifice the soul of our institutions for the sake of preserving the body; for we should, in that case, have only a dead body, soon to be dissolved.

The moral of this is, that those who undertake to save the Union by surrendering any principles of liberty or of justice are unsound and dangerous men, unfit to be trusted with any influence in our affairs. They are men who see the value of methods, but not the superior value of principles. They foolishly suppose that the body of a nation makes its soul, not knowing that the soul makes the body. They value forms more than substance, means more than ends.

Their counsels have already brought us, step by step, to the verge of dissolution. To save the Union, they have always been ready to surrender every thing which gave the Union value. By their advice, and to save the Union, we consented to the annexation of Texas, to the Mexican War, to surrender the Wilmot Proviso, to pass the Fugitive-slave Law, to repeal the Missouri Compromise ; and now they advise us to surrender every remaining barrier of freedom against the encroachments of slavery.

What can the North concede for the sake of union ?

All sorts of concessions are proposed. We are invited to repeal all our laws which were enacted in order to secure the personal liberty of our citizens ; to allow the whole immense territory of the United States to be made slave territory ; to divide it between slavery and freedom ; to forbid the discussion of slavery in the Free States. And especially we are invited, above all things else, and as the most essential thing of all, to change our fundamental opinions on the right and wrong of slavery. We are asked to believe that it is right, and not wrong.

Now, it is evident, that, with the best dispositions in the world, we are positively unable to do some of these things. Every Free State in the Union has just voted — most of them by immense majorities — that slavery ought to be excluded by law from the Territories. This vote did not proceed from impulse, but resulted from deliberate conviction. The whole ques-

tion had been argued and re-argued ; and the Northern mind at last settled in this deliberate conviction of duty. Even if every Slave State should secede in consequence, the masses, which have gradually consolidated in the great Republican party, are determined not to surrender this principle. Convictions are not to be changed by threats. A few, who consider themselves as leaders of the Republicans, but who really never belonged to them, may give way ; but they will merely thereby cease to be leaders, and fall in the rear. But the masses of great parties are logical and consistent : they move steadily forward in the direction of their ideas. Whatever Republican leader consents to compromise a Republican principle for the sake of peace or union, at once disappears from all leadership in the party. Such will probably be the fate of very many Northern men, who will follow the footsteps of Messrs. Everett, Winthrop, Hillard, and others, into private life. This is inevitable.

The Republican party is firmly convinced, that the only safety for the country is to be found in repressing slavery by all constitutional means. It has a constitutional right to repress it in the Territories. It will not touch it in the States ; but it will not fail to exclude it from the Territories. Any Republican who consents to admit slavery into a single acre of territory belonging to the Union ceases to be a Republican.

All talk, therefore, of reviving the Missouri Compromise line, and all schemes of the sort, are idle. The people have lost their faith in compromises.

There is an upper and a nether mill-stone of principle, between which all such compromises will be ground to powder. The upper mill-stone is the conviction, that slavery is a wrong and an evil, and ought to be abolished wherever we have the power to do so : the lower mill-stone is the conviction, that slavery is right and good, and ought to be extended. Between these two principles there can be no compromise, but only irrepressible conflict. There is a large body, no doubt, of well-meaning but illogical men, who do not perceive it. They have no clear conviction on the subject. They do not know whether slavery is right or wrong, good or bad. They think it is rather good, and rather bad ; right here, and wrong there. They call themselves practical people, and think that they are choosing the golden mean, the safe middle way : and so they say peace, where there is no peace ; they daub the wall with untempered mortar, put new wine into old bottles, new cloth into an old garment, try to serve two masters ; and so lose, at last, all efficiency, and float helplessly, like driftwood, on any current.

There are some questions which cannot be postponed for ever. They must at last be decided. From time to time, there comes a day of judgment to nations as to men, when the axe is laid at the root of the tree. Apparently, that time has come with us in regard to slavery, when the issue must be met and the question settled. The money-market may refuse to see it ; but the day of judgment is at hand. It comes, as it always comes, like a thief in the night,

taking us wholly by surprise. It finds the foolish virgins with no oil in their lamps ; incapable, therefore, of giving us any light. But there are those who have long been expecting this crisis, and who are not taken unprepared ; watchmen who have seen the sword coming, and have given the people warning ; Cassandras, indeed, whose predictions have been always disbelieved, but who have spoken their word, whether men would hear or forbear. They have known well that this question must at last be decided. Often have they implored the people to decide it, when it was easier than it is now : but now the time has come when the people themselves feel that any further postponement is impossible ; that the issue must be met, and met now.

Can the Free States consent to repeal their PERSONAL-LIBERTY BILLS ?

They are strongly urged to do so by persons of great eminence, and whose opinions justly have much influence with the community. Still, great men are not always wise. They are under many influences which may disturb their judgment. Some of them, perhaps all of them, have already committed themselves in regard to this question ; some, from their associations, have been scarcely capable of fairly looking at both sides ; some are constitutionally timid ; some, conservatives of that extreme order described by Paul Carrier, who says, that, if they had been present at the creation, they would have said, “*Conservons-nous la chaos.*” We must, therefore, ask for their reasons, going beyond their authority.

Judge Shaw, Mr. B. R. Curtis, and the other eminent men who have recently advised Massachusetts to repeal her Liberty Bill, have unfortunately omitted entirely all consideration of a very important part of the subject. They declare that the Personal-liberty Bill of Massachusetts is in conflict with the Constitution and Laws of the United States, because it assumes jurisdiction in a case where Congress has assumed jurisdiction for the United States. But they do not state why the Massachusetts Law was passed, and what it was designed to remedy. They do not allude to the fact, that, by the Fugitive-slave Act of 1850, any colored man can be taken from the State where he is living as a free man, and made a slave, without the question of his slavery or freedom being brought to trial. Massachusetts simply gives him a trial. The Personal-liberty Bill of Massachusetts, passed in 1855 and amended in 1858, does not refuse to surrender the fugitive from slavery, if he is a fugitive: it merely refuses to allow her free citizens to be kidnapped, and turned into slaves, without a trial. Under the provisions of the Fugitive-slave Bill of 1850, if a man in South Carolina goes before a judge, and makes an affidavit that a man in Massachusetts, named John Brown, is his slave, John Brown may be arrested, and carried before a United-States commissioner, who has only to be satisfied that he is the John Brown intended in the affidavit. If satisfied on this question of identity, he issues his certificate, and John Brown is carried off as a slave. This United-States commissioner is appointed by the

United-States judge ; but he is no judge himself. He may be a mere boy, ignorant of law as of justice, who received his commission because he was a Union saver, believing that the Union is safer whenever a colored man can be turned into a slave.

Now, while we wish to *defer to the opinion* of such gentlemen as have signed their names to the Address, and are disposed to do so, two or three things are to be considered, which these gentlemen have omitted to state : —

1. If these gentlemen had been sitting as judges, after having heard the case fully argued before them, and giving a judgment under judicial responsibility, such a judgment from Lemuel Shaw, Benjamin R. Curtis, and Joel Parker, would have had commanding influence. They are, no doubt, learned in the law ; but they are not now giving a judicial decision, but only political advice. Now, the views of most of these gentlemen on politics have long been known to our community ; and, unfortunately, the people of Massachusetts have been obliged, after much deliberation, to disagree with them. Their political advice, therefore, as to what legislation is desirable in Massachusetts, will probably have little weight. Massachusetts differs from most of these gentlemen fundamentally and radically.

2. We have already repealed a part of the law of 1855, at the request of Gov. Banks. All that was then considered to be unconstitutional, or suspected of being so, was repealed in 1858. We did not wait till the courts decided it to be so. We did not wait for

any threats or any requests from the South. We repealed what part seemed to us objectionable, of our own accord. Having done this, it would not be wise, dignified, or like statesmen, to do more, without better reason than the informal opinion of some worthy gentlemen. If the law is in any part unconstitutional, it can easily be shown to be so. The courts are open to decide that question. They would not recommend the people of Massachusetts to repeal other statutes in this way. They would say, "Wait till the courts decide them to be unconstitutional." So we say now.

3. These gentlemen omit to notice the reason and purpose of the Liberty Law of 1855. Its main object is, not to repeal the Fugitive-slave Bill or abolish it, but to prevent kidnapping. There are in Massachusetts ten thousand free colored people, — citizens of the State, — paying taxes, voting at the polls, doing military duty, and having a right to be protected by the State. The fifth article of the Amendments to the Constitution of the United States declares, that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, *without due process of law* ;" and the seventh article declares, that in suits at common law, when the value in controversy shall exceed *twenty dollars*, the *right of trial by jury shall be preserved*."

But any one of the ten thousand colored citizens of Massachusetts may be taken at any moment, and turned into a slave, without "*due process of law*," — without any trial at all, — without seeing either judge or jury.

Now, those who propose to us to repeal this law ought at least to suggest some other method by which the rights of Massachusetts freemen may be protected. This has not been done. Apparently, it is thought a matter of small consequence what becomes of our free colored citizens, if only Southern gentlemen may be enabled to recover their slaves.

By the Fugitive-slave Act of 1850, a man in South Carolina can go before a Judge, and offer proof that a certain man living in Massachusetts is his slave. That shall be put on record, and that record shall be taken as proof of two things: first, that the man in Massachusetts is a slave; second, that he escaped. Then he goes to a commissioner in Massachusetts for only one other thing; viz., to prove the identity of the person seized.

Thus are all the old guarantees of liberty overthrown, and all protection for colored citizens taken away. This *Liberty Act* does protect them. Since its passage in 1855, not a colored man has been seized in Massachusetts, nor have any courts pronounced it unconstitutional. Why, then, repeal it?

4. The gentlemen solemnly declare, that "there are laws on our Statute Book which are in conflict with the Constitution and Laws of the United States." When they speak thus solemnly, it may be supposed that they are not using words carelessly. We deny the assertion that the Liberty Bill is opposed to the Constitution, or can fairly be said or thought to be so. It may be opposed to the laws, — that is, to the Fugitive-slave Law; but it is not opposed to the Consti-

tution. We will grant that the famous, or infamous, clause in Art. 4 requires the return of fugitives; but it does not prescribe *how* they shall be returned. The Massachusetts Law says they shall have a trial: the United-States Law says *not*. The United-States Law is, therefore, more opposed to the Federal Constitution than the Massachusetts Law is; since the Constitution orders a jury trial, and says, "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

What are the provisions of this Liberty Bill, with which so much fault is found?

1. Its first three sections give to every person claimed as a fugitive, or imprisoned in any way, the writ of HABEAS CORPUS, as of right. There can be no objection to this; since the United-States Constitution (art. 1, sect. 9, clause 2) declares that this writ shall not be suspended, except in time of war. It takes possession of the prisoner, and carries him before a judge to have the cause of his restraint examined into.

Sects. 4, 5, and 6 give the alleged fugitive a jury trial.

Sect. 7 punishes any person attempting to make a slave of any one who is not a slave.

Sects. 9, 15, 16, forbid all persons holding authority under the State of Massachusetts, as judges, sheriffs, constables, or jailers, to assist in the return of a fugitive.

Sects. 17, 18, 19, provide that the person claimed as fugitive shall be defended by commissioners ap-

pointed and paid by the State, and that he shall not be confined in any State jail.

Unquestionably, the purpose of the law is to make it difficult to retake a fugitive in Massachusetts ; and it *has* done so. It says to the man claiming his brother as a slave, what Portia says to Shylock, "Take thy pound of flesh ; but take care you do not shed a drop of blood in doing it."

Well, have we not a right to do this?—to keep slavery to the letter of the law? Do not courts themselves construe some laws strictly, and that in the interest of freedom?

We do not believe — the people of Massachusetts do not believe — that it was ever intended by the Constitution that Congress should legislate on the subject. But, if Congress does legislate, then it should provide not merely for the return of the fugitive, *if a fugitive*, but also that he *shall not be returned* if a free man. But it has utterly neglected to do this. It has made the law as harsh and obnoxious as possible. Then we have a right to exhaust all legal contrivances to make it a nullity.

You tell us that slaves are happy and contented. Suppose we grant it. What, then, must be the character or the treatment of those who are obliged to escape? What love of liberty, what energy, what patience, what resource, and what motive for exertion, must they have! How must they be treated, to run all risks in order to gain a precarious freedom!

The result of this law has been to keep slave-catchers off the soil of Massachusetts for five years.

Is not that worth something? Shall we, by repealing it, publicly issue an invitation to slaveholders and kidnappers to come here again? Do conservative gentlemen wish us to revive the scenes of the Burns and the Sims renditions? Do they wish the militia under arms, Court Street in mourning, an angry mob attacking the Court House, and men shot and stabbed in our streets? The Personal-liberty Law has prevented such things. Let it stand!

What will be the results of secession, in the Slave States?

1. The almost immediate result of secession will be great financial embarrassment.

The revenues of the United States from customs are received at the ports in the Free States mainly. The revenue received in 1853 at the port of New York was over thirty-eight million dollars; at Boston, over seven million; at Philadelphia, over four million; while the total amount received at the ports of Charleston, Savannah, and Mobile, was less than one million. If they open their ports, and inaugurate free trade, they lose even this amount of revenue, and must depend entirely upon direct taxation. This taxation must fall directly on the slaveholders, since they alone possess the property. Any attempt to collect the amount required by a poll-tax would produce immediate insurrection, or a general emigration of the non-slaveholding whites. The slaveholders must tax themselves; and they will then realize the force of Franklin's proverb, and find that they are paying very dear for their whistle.

Let us see, then, what the revenue and what the expenditure of the South would be.

The revenues collected from customs in the Northern ports of the United States, in 1853, were, —

New York	\$38,289,341
Boston	7,203,048
Philadelphia	4,537,046
San Francisco	1,794,140
Portland	350,349
Cincinnati	251,649
New Haven	125,173
Oswego	128,667
	<hr/>
	\$52,679,413
Charleston	\$432,299
Savannah	125,755
Mobile	102,981
	<hr/>
	\$661,035

This is the whole revenue from customs of the five seceding States: —

New Orleans	\$2,628,421
Baltimore	836,437
Richmond	73,992
Norfolk	31,255
	<hr/>
	\$3,570,115

The total revenue from customs received by the Free States, therefore, amounts to between fifty and sixty millions.

The total revenue of all the Slave States, to *less than* five millions.

And the total revenue of the five seceding States amounts to less than one million of dollars.

Of course, they will have no income from the sale of public lands.

The seceding States will necessarily be military. They must have an army, and a pretty large one, to keep down their three million of slaves, and to resist the aggressions which they expect from the Free States. A navy they will not try to have; for they have neither ships nor sailors. But an army they must have.

Now, the War Department of the United States takes, year by year, some eight million dollars. Suppose that the seceding States should be contented with an army of half its size: that would cost them, with forts, ammunition, cannon, &c., some four million dollars a year. But all their revenue from customs is not a million. It is evident, then, that they must resort to direct taxation, and that before the end of the first year. They may lay a duty on goods which come from the North; but this involves an expensive system of revenue-officers to prevent smuggling over the long frontier-line.

Direct taxation will come in a year, and will fall at once on slave-property: the slaveholders, who own the property, and for whose sake the secession takes place, will have to bear the expenses of their new State.

2. The next result of secession, to the seceding States, will be the danger of slave insurrection.

The fear of insurrection is the nightmare of the South. The evil is as great in the apprehension as in the reality. The constant terror to the whites, and the consequent restraint, severity, and denial of privileges to the slaves, produce a mass of evil beyond computation.

3. Democratic insurrection by the poor whites. This seems to be the chief apprehension at the present time. These ignorant, poor, and degraded whites seem determined now to assert their right to their share in the Government.

4. War with the North-western States and the Union.

If Louisiana secede, it will hardly be possible to avoid war. The people of the Valley of the Mississippi will never allow the mouth of that river to be held by a foreign power. At the beginning of the present century, when there was not a single steamboat on the Mississippi or its tributaries, there was danger, first, of a Western secession, and then of a war with France, in consequence of New Orleans being in the hands of a foreign power. The people of the Valley are already very much irritated at the outrages inflicted on their citizens in the Slave States; and it would require no Peter the Hermit to preach a Western crusade for the capture of New Orleans. The danger of war lies just at this point; and, if Louisiana secede, it can hardly be avoided.

These are the principal dangers which will immediately be felt by the seceding States, — financial ruin, slave insurrection, social anarchy, and war. The result, sooner or later, will be the abolition of slavery. Slaves will be emancipated, either by their own act or that of their masters. A military despotism may precede or follow this event; but the final result will be a reconstruction of the Union, minus the element of slavery. And as slavery is the only disturbing

element in our institutions, a Union which omits that will probably be permanent. Secession, therefore, would seem to be the providential method for the abolition of slavery. He who causes the wrath of man to praise Him will restrain the remainder of wrath, and bring us peace in the end. The secessionists are blindly working out His purposes. Mad with dreams of empire, they do not see (what all the world beside sees) that secession is the direct step to emancipation. What the whole power of the North could not accomplish, even if the whole North were abolitionists, they are doing themselves. Such is the blindness which has possessed them. Still holding in their hands the control of the Union, and able to do almost any thing they will, they give up all this power from an imaginary fear, and so run into a real danger. Had they been satisfied with any concession, reasonable or unreasonable, there is great danger that we should have yielded it to them. The ancients said, that those whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad; but Christians must rather believe that God drives men mad, not to destroy, but to save.

Secession will, no doubt, also produce suffering at the North. It will interrupt commerce, depress manufactures, and diminish the profits of agriculture. We must take our share of suffering; but our share will be very much the lightest. We have the two great advantages of free labor and an immensely diversified industry. Southern industry is almost exclusively agricultural, and that confined to a very few

staples ; but the industry of the North flows through a thousand channels. We are at once agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing. If every cotton factory in Massachusetts were closed to-morrow, although it would produce a great amount of evil, it would not be irreparable ; for it constitutes less than one-tenth of the industrial products of the State. The annual cotton manufacture of Massachusetts, including calico, bleached and colored goods, amounts to the vast sum of thirty-six million dollars ; but the Secretary of State, in publishing the statistical returns of Massachusetts for 1855, gives it as his fixed persuasion, that Massachusetts industry amounts to more than a million dollars a day for each working-day in the year.

The duties of the Free States are so simple and so plain, that we cannot doubt their being fulfilled. Firmness, calmness, kindness, — this is all. There is no concession to be made ; for we have nothing to concede. What the South asks it is impossible to grant ; and what we can grant would not satisfy her. No concession which the North can or will make would be of the least value. If, indeed, we could surrender the whole or half the territories to perpetual slavery ; if we would admit the principle of the Dred-Scott decision, — that the colored man has no rights which the white man is bound to respect ; if we should repeal all laws protecting our own citizens from being kidnapped, and consent to the indefinite increase and extension of slavery, — it is possible that the Slave States might be satisfied. Possible, but doubtful ; for the

principal difficulties would still remain. We should still differ from them as to the fundamental question, Is slavery right or wrong? and there still would remain the fact, that the political power of the country is passing out of their hands into ours. The *gravamen* of our offence is, that we are stronger than they. Free labor has made us rich; free schools have made us intelligent; free speech has made us strong. The people of the Old World, in love with liberty, hating oppression, throng to our shores, turning aside from the slave-blasted regions of the South. The roar of manufacturing industry is heard in all our valleys; the shrill cry of the rushing locomotive echoes, from all our hills. Our real crime is that we are strong, and growing stronger. If we could concede a part of our population, if we could repeal our wealth, if we could compromise our political strength, the slave-power might be satisfied; but, as this is impossible, all compromises will be ineffectual.

Nothing remains for us, then, but to be firm, calm, and kind. We are strong enough and safe enough to wait. After they have plundered our arsenals and seized our forts, or even fulfilled Gov. Wise's programme, and taken possession, by force, of the Capitol and Treasury at Washington, they will still be weak and poor. Strength and riches will remain with the Free States. We can say to them, "Make up your minds, gentlemen, as to what you want to do, and let us know. Discuss the matter among yourselves, and decide. If one, two, or fifteen States really be-

lieve that they shall be safer and more prosperous out of the Union than they are now, and decide to go out, however sorry we may be at this decision, we must consent to it. Let us part in peace. We are willing to be not only just, but generous, in the terms of separation. You shall have all the proportion of goods that falleth to you. Property and money we will concede, — money-loving Yankees as we are, — but not principle. Go, and try your experiment. See what can be made of a pure slaveholding republic. Then turn it, if you will, into a slaveholding monarchy; inaugurate a slaveholding despotism; consolidate your States into one empire; relinquish the State sovereignties of which you have been so proud; give up all your own liberties, rather than give up negro slavery. Perpetually driven forward by the stern logic of necessity, give your despot a standing army, and arm him with irresponsible power. Then repeat the story of the Mexican and South-American States. Let revolution succeed revolution, till the Muse of History drops her pen in despair, unable to chronicle the fast-flying changes of a State always in unstable equilibrium. Let Jefferson Davis proclaim himself emperor, and Mr. Toombs revolt, and seize the crown. Finally, let some desperate faction or hard-pressed chief seek strength by proclaiming the abolition of slavery; for this is the fatal and necessary termination to which you are moving. We will look on and wait, pursuing in peace our dull mechanic tasks, until you have tried the whole series of your experiments;

and finally, when you have come to yourselves, and desire to come back to the old family house, with your one evil institution left behind, we shall be happy to receive you again. Then we shall be able to commence together a magnificent progress, greater and better than any thing which statesman has planned or poet dreamed. We may then found a truly Christian Commonwealth, whose gates shall be named Salvation; and its walls, Praise. Then we shall have a true Christian democracy, in which all, from the least to the greatest, shall have their rights secured to them, and in which all the great and complicated problems of social life shall find their solution."

Our duty, therefore, is the simple one of waiting, trusting in Providence. We must beware of seeking a false peace by concession. We owe it to the slaveholders themselves not to concede what they ask. It will be as bad for them as for us to have slavery increased. They need free territory as a city of refuge to which to escape. We owe it to our children not to postpone any longer the decision of this question. Sooner or later it is to be met; and it had better be met now, and decided. It is evident that compromises at last must cease; that, sooner or later, concession must have an end; that we cannot for ever yield to the demands of slavery, enforced by the threat of secession. Let us take our stand here frankly and firmly.

The question, then, is now to be SETTLED, not compromised. The time is favorable, as far as the Free

States are concerned. Our crops have been abundant, our commerce prosperous, our manufactures in a healthy condition. The North is united, the South divided. Hitherto, the reverse has been the case; but now Virginia and Kentucky and Maryland do not wish to unite with South Carolina and Georgia. They feel it impossible to do so. They suggest, therefore, an absurd and impossible union of the Northern Slave States and Southern Free States. They wish to have a union which shall contain Virginia, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, and Maryland, from the South; Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, from the North. But what motive could Pennsylvania and Ohio have for linking their destinies with Virginia rather than with New York and New England? Are not Ohio and Pennsylvania as strongly Republican as any New-England State? Did not Pennsylvania give seventy thousand majority for Lincoln? Is she not the very banner State of the Republican party? There is more fellowship to-day between Massachusetts and Virginia than between Pennsylvania and Virginia.

Such calculations overlook the fact, that every Free State voted for Lincoln in November last. The conduct of South Carolina has only strengthened them in their hostility to the evil system of slavery, the source of all our troubles. When the Union divides, the Free States will keep together.

It is fortunate for us, at the present crisis, that the executive power of the Free States is in the hands of

men who are sworn to freedom. In times of peace, a governor is rather ornamental than useful, — good for receiving princes, and delivering addresses at agricultural fairs ; but in times of danger, when treason stalks abroad and men begin to talk rebellion, the governor of a State is the most important person in it. The whole military power of the State is in his hands ; and, if in the right hands, he can preserve the peace, and quell the first buddings of treason.

South Carolina has put herself in the wrong by her rebellious acts and her revolutionary measures. She has seemed to choose armed revolution rather than peaceable secession. While we believe a State has a right to secede, we also believe that it must be done peaceably, and by agreement with the other States. This she must try first ; and, failing this, she may resort to revolution. But South Carolina has not tried this. Instead of asking leave to secede, and treating on the terms of secession, she has rent herself away by violence, and seized the property of the Union. This ought not to be allowed. She must be compelled to keep the peace first ; and then we may proceed to treat with her..

The talk of preventing Mr. Lincoln's inauguration by acts of violence is preposterous. That, when eighteen sovereign States have elected a President by constitutional means, their will can be set aside by such ridiculous measures as are proposed, is simply absurd. If the votes cannot be counted in Washington, they can be counted elsewhere. Mr. Lincoln

will be President, if alive, on the fourth day of March next; and will then use the whole military and naval power of the nation to put down rebellion and enforce the laws. In this he will have the support of the immense majority of the people, the army and navy of the United States, the governors of every State north of the Potomac, and the militia of the Union. When peace is restored, when the laws are enforced, when the country is quiet, — then, if the Southern States, or any of them, desire to leave the Union, in my opinion they should be allowed to do so. But the Union will remain the same glorious Union without them as with them. The disturbing elements eliminated, it will rise to a greater height of prosperity and power.

The true course for the Republican party to take, and one in which all true citizens and patriots will support them, is, therefore, plain. Let their watchword be, "The Union, the Constitution, and the Enforcement of the Laws;" no concession to treason, no compromise with rebellion. We cannot coerce a State to remain in the Union against its will. We must not attempt to do this. But we will not allow any State to go out in a violent and revolutionary way. The laws must be obeyed by all parts of the country till any part is formally released from that obedience by the common consent. The public property seized by South Carolina must be restored: then we can treat with her about seceding.

It is the first duty of the Government to put down

forcible resistance to the laws. The present Executive has made haste to do this in Kansas. A mere riot there summons to the spot Gen. Harney (whose fidelity to slavery was proved in St. Louis by whipping to death a negro woman) and the United-States dragoons. But men pursuing their peaceful avocations in Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas, are whipped and hung by mobs to the number of hundreds, and the Government takes no notice; the forts are seized, and it remains silent; the custom-house and arsenals are robbed, and it does nothing. Suppose that Massachusetts had tarred and feathered a single Southern slaveholder; suppose she had seized the Charlestown Navy-yard; suppose her mobs had sent back to the South the families which are now being sent here for safety: it is probable that we should have a President's proclamation within twenty-four hours, and perhaps some of our own citizens proclaiming, in pompous and inflated speech, that treason had been committed, and that the traitors should immediately be punished. But no such gentlemen open their mouths now to rebuke Southern treason. They are only bold in denouncing their own State, — only determined when liberty is to be crushed out, and Northern prejudices in behalf of justice and humanity to be trampled down.

The course of the Free States is plain; their path is as a shining light; their duties, and those of their chosen President, are manifest, — fairness, coolness, kindness, no concession of principle, but determination

in doing their duty to the Union and to the country. This course will unite all parties in their support; and we shall soon see one overwhelming North restoring the peace of the land, and enabling even the Slave States, if they will, to retrace their steps, and share once more in our great prosperity.

Yours,

A MASSACHUSETTS CITIZEN.